G. R. S. 59] (FB—1o,000—20 12 13

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

~~191~~ . 1899
(Miscellaneous)

File No. 5

(Serial IV)

Serial Nos.

Papers Filed.

Month November 1924.

SUBJECT

File re. Recognising the claim of Bai alias Rama Bai to the Puja Hak Anjaneya Swami temple at Hanasoge Yadgiri

PREVIOUS REFERENCES

LATER REFERENCES.

G.R.S. 11] 1904-05

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(Rev: Mis.)

NOTES.

Mmz File No. 5 of 1899 00

FILE HEADING.

Dispute in connection with the puja hak of the Anjaneya Swami Temple at Hanasoge, Gedatore Taluk, with the Inam land attached to it.

From

The Secretary to Govt. Municipal Department.

No. 272 Dated 15 7. 04 Received 15 7 04

Diary No. 416 Appeal No 5 of 04-05	Enclos. one pah of the connected file Spare Copies.	Serial No.

BRIEF ABSTRACT OF LETTER.

Forwards for disposal by the Council Committee of an application from the guardian Sheema Row of the Minor Respondents in Appeal No 91 of 03 02, praying for a review of the Govt decn passed in the case & for the stay of Execution of the said Govt decn till the disposal of the application.

NOTES AND ORDERS.

The Review application is sufficiently stamped and in time. The applicant has also submitted a petition to this Secretariat praying for the stay of Execution of the Govt order pending the disposal of the Review application. The

NOTES—First sheet.

MGCPB—5,000—18-5 04

Serial No.

papers are submitted for orders by the Secy

SKR 20/7/04. 21/7/.

Lay before the Councillor

21.7.1904

There has been a change in the composition of the Council since the order complained of was passed - by which the present Second Councillor in Division gave the Petitioners a hearing, the application may be posted for hearing - No notice to the other side was at present called for; nor any order directing the stay of execution - C.

22/7/04.

The case was fully considered & nothing new has been urged in the present application - C

Lay before the 2nd Councillor 22/7/04.

22/7/1904

No 45

22/7/1904

NOTE—Contd sheet

Serial No.

The posts may be given as
he usual before proceeding
further and orders on the Revenue
posts.

24/7/04
25

Post for hearing
25/7/1904

MGCPB- 10 000—19-5 04

Note continued.

The Committee of the Council rejected the Review Petition put in by the Plaintiffs (represented by guardian Bheema Rao). Vide printed copy of the Order No. 2889, dated 10th February 1905.

Flag S

Yeswanta Rao, who was one of the minor Plaintiffs in the above mentioned appeal, has himself now petitioned to H. H. the Maharaja, praying for a re-consideration of the orders passed against him as stated above. This petition has been forwarded to this Office for disposal, ~~under~~ under cover of the Private Secretary's Memo No. 523, dated 24th August 1906.

Beyond stating that the Stamp papers used for the Deed of Gift on which the Defendant bases his claim was not of the kind in use at the

time the deed was executed, and also beyond producing an authenticated copy of an Order passed by Govt in the General & Revenue Deptt noticing the untrustworthy character of the defendant, the plaintiff has not urged any fresh grounds in support of his case.

2590 Rec

Forwarded (with the File) to the Secretary to Govt, General and Revenue Departments, for being placed before a Committee of the Council.

By Order
Bhaskarasama Rao
Secretary to Govt
Muzrai Deptt

Bangalore
1st Septr 1906

This is an application, addressed to H.H. the Maharaja, praying

Flag G

a second review of the Govt. order passed by the Council committee.

In addition to the grounds mentioned in the above note, the petr. urges that as it has already been held by Govt. in N.S. 188 of 92-93 that the donee was Krishnacharya it was a final pronouncement & should not have been reopened in any subsequent case between the same parties or their representatives in interest. This argument is answered in para 3 of the order under revision, in which it is stated that the above statement cannot have the force of a finding as it does not occur in the body of the decision, but in the resume of the facts of the case.

Subd
6 Bk Cs prs
5/9/06

990
7.9.06

S 7961 Appeals appl.
An Memo.

Muzrai Secretariat. | File No. of 190

MGCPB—3,500—15-10-04

Muzrai Secretariat. | File No. of 190

Jurisdiction has been rejected -
It seems unexpedient to entertain
this second appln. more especially
as on a perusal of the first decision
it was brought to be observed the
decision seems to me to be substan-
tially correct and deserving to be
upheld - I would reject this 2nd
application also

Secy to Govt

W.G.P.D
7/9/06

I concur

W.W.H
8/9/06

Rec'd 8/9/06

1507

N. R. 3165
8/13-9-1906

Forwarded to the Secretary to
Government in the Muzrai Deptt.
for favour of further action.

By order

for Secretary.

Rec'd 13/9/06
Papers returned to Asst Secy Muzrai
9/06

MGCPB—3,500—15-10-01

Muzrai Secretariat. | File No | of 190

Muzrai Secretariat. | File No. of 190

Note continued

The endorsement was accordingly issued. Yeswanta Rao of Hansoge having subsequently petitioned Govt on the same subject, he was referred to the previous endorsements already issued to him.

566/1876 dy 30·10·1907

He has memorialized H H the maharaja praying for a re-consideration of the orders of Govt on the subject. The memorial has been forwarded for disposal to this office with the direction that the petitioner may be informed that H H the maharaja will not interfere in the matter.

Submitted with a draft endorsement for the Dewan thro' 2nd Councillor.

Submitted to the 2nd Councillor for perusal & the Dewan's orders
2/12/07

2nd Councillor
3/12/07

3/12/07

6825
7.11.07

Submitted to the Dewan
7/11/07

May be approved
3/12/07

Dewan's orders
This paper need not have been sent to me
BD
3/12/07

GPB—3,000—22 6 06
30. 11 07

File No. of 190 | Muzrai Secretariat.

2 Drafts

Before the Govt of H. H
the Maharaja of Mysore
&c

Review application
No. 3 of 1904-05.

Petitioners

1. Yeshwant Rao.
2. Gothu Bayi
minors by guardian
Sheena Rao.

Subject

Application for a review of
G. O. No. 3572 — Mug. 7. 5-99
dated 20th May 1904,
recognizing the claim
of ~~the appellant~~ of
Pillu Bayi alias Rama
Bayi ~~as~~ ~~the~~ ~~Pujaka~~
to the Pujaka of the Anja-
neyaswami Temple at
Hanasoge in the Godakere Jaheer
and the inam lands attached
thereto.

Counsellor
28.1.1905

Read
27-1-05
Print

2d Counsellor
28.1.1905.

31/1/05

Send to Govt for Issue
1.2.1905

Land Revenue Secretariat.

File No. of 190

Serial No.

Order

~~Draft~~

This is a re-submission for the issue of Land-Revenue warrants in respect of the year 1903-04.

The enclosures are the Joint-Petition of Rattan-Shi and Gift-Deed which Baladas made in favour of Dropati-Debi to his minor son Ramchandra, for which Stamp Paper for the purpose stated in the petition, and the enclosures referred to by Krishna-Kanai Miter disposition in 1869 were again in the Joint-Petition of Rattan and Ramchandra in 1891

Note—Contn sheet

Serial No.

[illegible] established beyond a shadow of doubt that the document is a genuine one. Exhibits could have no special interest in any one of this case unless Krishnaji as the petitioner contends in the petition, the Police should be called as the engagement of the room [illegible] to the temple, [illegible] it is natural that Gopi among half a hundred [illegible] of this nature on condition that it should [illegible] to the [illegible] of the community, more [illegible] the allegation did without made [illegible]

General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. of 190

Serial No.

Copies of all communications & the documents attached thereto addressed to the Collector of Nellore enclosed that the defendant was entitled to the Puja lands & to all the mamul dues & grants & to remove the decision in the absence of any fresh grounds, and direct that the Revenue Authorities be requested to remain undisturbed

To 1st Commissioner & 16.1.1905

15/1/1905

1478/18-1-05

To Board I & 19.1.1905

19-1-05.

No. 2889 D/10.2.05

Mad. F.S. 99 Copy of the above is forwarded to the Dy. Commissioner & Inspector Gl. for information

27.1.05

Secretary

Note—Contn sheet

MGCPB-10 000—19 5 01

S.K.R. 24/1/05

MUZRAI

Muz 1

MYSORE MUZRAI DEPT.

Registered No.— 1371

Name of Petitioner— [illegible]

Address— [illegible]

Date of Petition— 9-1-04

Date of Receipt— 12-1-04

No. of Enclosures—

Abstract

[illegible]

Submitted to the Dewan
28/1/04

563
31.1.04

This has since been re-submitted with Dewan's
n 30 / 1 / 04

[illegible]

The Petition Branch

MGCPB—500—28-8-01.

MYSORE GOVERNMENT

1397

12/1/04
ks

No 2206-07 1.2.04
Mus: F 5-99 Encl file
& V.P.P one bundle

Mus: F 5 of 1899 re Puja Hak of the Sri Anjaneya Swami temple at Hansoge, Yedatore Taluk

---

Forwarded (with the file) to the Secretary to Government, Genl and Rev Depart^ts, for favour of the case being placed before a Committee of the Council

By Order,

Sd/- L Anantasami Rao

Deputy Secy: Mus: Dept^t

30.1.1904

"Copy"

No. 2354, dt. 10.12.04

To

The Director,
Commercial Taxes,
Hyderabad.

Sir,

Sub: Commercial Taxes Department – Revised Rates of Tax on Cinematograph Films – Orders – Issued.

Ref: Govt. Memo. No. 1397, Fin. (CT.II) Dept., dt. 8.12.04.

I am directed to forward herewith a copy of the Government Memo. cited for information and necessary action.

Yours faithfully,

Sd/-

Dy. Secy.

Encl: As above.

Dft

Dy: Secy.

Fin. Depart

8/12/04

MYSORE GOVERNMENT
1824.
MUZRAI SECRETARIAT

(H)
ನಂಬರ್.

~~ಹುಬ್ಬಳ್ಳಿ ಡಿವಿಶನ್ ಕಛೇರಿಯಿಂದ.~~

ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಅಮಲ್ ದಾರ್ರಿಗೆ ಬರಸಿ

ಕಳುಹಿಸಿದ ನಿರೂಪ ಅದಾಗಿ—

ಇಲ್ಲಿನ ಸ್ಟ 1903–904ನೇ ಇಸವಿ ರೆವಿನ್ಯೂ ಆಫೀಸ್ 71 ನೇ ನಂಬರು

ಮೊಕದ್ದಮೆಯು ಕಛೇರಿಗಾರರು ಮೊರ್ಜಿನ್ನಲ್ಲಿ ನಮೂದಾದವರ ಹೆಸರಿಗೆ ತಯಾರಾದ

ಅರ್ಜಿಗಳು.

ನೋಟೀಸುಗಳನ್ನು ಇದರ ಹಿಂದೆ ರಹಾ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿರುತ್ತೆ. ಕ್ರಮ ಪ್ರಕಾರ

ಜಾರಿಯಿಂದ ಅಸಲ್ ನೋಟೀಸುಗಳನ್ನು ಕೂಡ್ಲೆ ಈ ಆಫೀಸಿಗೆ ವಾಪಸ್ ಕಳುಹಿಸತಕ್ಕದ್ದು.

ಬತಾರೀಖು 16 ನೇ ಮಾಹೆ ಫೆಬ್ರವರಿ 1904ನೇ

ಇಸವಿ, ದ ಜಾಗಾ ಧಾರವಾಡ.

By Order,

Secretary.

MGCPB—500—23-2-03.

1259

20-2-05

1324

Mukta Ram

1534

1476

1165

4-3-04

4-3-04

984

4-3-04

ಸೂಪರ್ರಿಂಟೆಂಡೆಂಟ್ ಆಫೀಸ್ ಪ್ರೆಸ್
SECRETARIAT PRESS GOVT.
ಮೂಲೆಗೆ ಹಿಡಿದಿಟ್ಟಿರುವುದು.

71

1903 —90/ನೇ ಇಸವಿ ರೆವಿನ್ಯು ಅಪೀಲು ನಂಬರು.....

ಅಪೀಲು ವಾದಿ

ಅಪೀಲು ಪ್ರತಿವಾದಿ

ಮೇಲೆಕಂಡ ಅಪೀಲು ಪ್ರತಿವಾದಿಗಳು ಇವರಿಗೆ.

ಅಪೀಲು ವಾದಿ ———— ನು

ಮೇಲ್ಕಂಡ ಅಪೀಲು ಪಿಟಿಷನ್ನಿಕ್ಕು ಡೆಪ್ಯುಟಿ ಕಮಿಷನರವರೆ ಹುಕುಮಿನ್ನೆ ಮೇಲೆ ಡಾಖಲುಮಾಡಿ ಇರುವ ಅಪೀಲು 1904ನೇ ಇಸವಿ ಮೇ ತಿಂಗಳಿಗೆ ——ನೇ ತಾರೀಖಿನ ದಿವಸ ಆಗಾಗ ಲಿರಾಕಾರ ಮೊಕ್ತಾಮಿನಲ್ಲಿ ವಿಚಾರಣೆ ಮಾಡಲ್ಪಡುವದ್ದರಿಂದ, ಆ ದಿವಸ ಪೂರ್ವಾಹ್ನ 11 ಘಂಟೆಗೆ ನೀನು ಈ ಕಚೇರಿಗೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗಬೇಕು.

ಬತಾರೀಖು 16ನೇ ಮಾಹೆ ಮೇ ಸಾಲು ಸರಿ 1904ನೇ ಇಸವಿ,

ಮೊಕ್ತಾಂ ಆಜ್ಞೆಯಂತೆ.

By Order,

Secretary.

MGCPB—1,000—21-2-05.

ਸਾਰੇ ਸਾਰੇ ਸਾਰੇ

ನೋಟೀಸು

ಹುಜೂರ್ ದಿವಾನ್ ಕಚೇರಿಯಿಂದ.

1903 –904ನೇ ಇಸವಿ ರೆವಿನ್ಯು ಅಪೀಲು ನಂಬರು 91

ಅಪೀಲು ವಾದಿ

ಅಪೀಲು ಪ್ರತಿವಾದಿಗಳು.

ಮೇಲ್‌ಕಂಡ ಅಪೀಲುವಾದಿ

ನೀನು ಲಿಂಗಸೂರು ಡಿಸ್ಟ್ರಿಕ್ಟ್ ಡೆಪ್ಯೂಟಿ ಕಮಿಷನರವರ ಹುಕುಮಿನ ಮೇಲೆ ಹುಜೂರಿಗೆ ಗುಜರಾಯಿಸಿದ 1901 ನೇ ಇಸವಿ ಡಿಸೆಂಬರ್ 26ನೇ ದಿವಸದ ಅಪೀಲು ಅರ್ಜಿಯು, 1904 ನೇ ಇಸವಿ ಮೇ ತಿಂಗಳ 4ನೇ ತಾರೀಖಿನ ದಿವಸ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಮೊಕ್ಕಾಮಿನಲ್ಲಿ ವಿಚಾರಣೆ ಮಾಡಲ್ಪಡುವದ್ದರಿಂದ, ಆ ದಿವಸ ಪೂರ್ವಾಹ್ನ 11 ಘಂಟೆಗೆ ನೀನು ಈ ಕಚೇರಿಗೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗಬೇಕು.

ಬತಾರೀಖು 18ನೇ ಮಾಹೆ ಏಪ್ರಿಲ್ 1904

ನೇ ಇಸವಿ, ಬೊಕ್ಕಾಂ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು.

By Order,

for Secretary.

MGCPB—1,000—24-2-03.

(H)
ನಂಬರ್.
202 ನೇ 3

MYSORE GOVERNMENT

ಹೊಸಕೋಟೆ ತಿರ್ಮಾ ಕಛೇರಿಯಿಂದ.

ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಅಮಲ್ ದಾರ್‌ಗೆ ಬರೆಸಿ

ಕಳುಹಿಸಿದ ನಿರೂಪ ಅದಾಗಿ—

ಇಲ್ಲಿನ ಸನ್ 1903–904ನೇ ಇಸವಿ ರೆವಿನ್ಯೂ ಅಫೀಲ್ 91 ನೇ ನಂಬರು

ಮೊಕದ್ದಮೆಯು ಕಕ್ಷಿಗಾರರು ಮೋರ್ಜಿನ್ನಲ್ಲಿ ನಮೋದಾದವರ ಹೆಸರಿಗೆ ತಯಾರಾದ

ನೋಟೀಸುಗಳನ್ನು ಇದರ ಹಿಂದೆ ರಹಾ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿರುತ್ತೆ. ಕ್ರಮ ಪ್ರಕಾರ

ಜಾರಿಯಿಂದ ಅಸಲ್ ನೋಟೀಸುಗಳನ್ನು ಕೂಡ್ಲೆ ಈ ಆಫೀಸಿಗೆ ವಾಪಸ್ ಕಳುಹಿಸತಕ್ಕದ್ದು.

ಬತಾರೀಖು 16 ನೇ ಮಾಹೆ ಡಿಸೆಂಬರ್ ನ 1904ನೇ

ಇಸವಿ, ದ ಜಾಗಾ

By Order,

Secretary.

MGCPB—500--23-2-03.

ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ ಎಸ್‌ಡಿಎ 170 ಎಲ್‌ಸಿಎ 04

ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ 522

ಸೇವೆಯಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಮತ್ತು ನಿವೃತ್ತಿ ಹೊಂದಿದ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ ನೌಕರರಿಗೆ ಮತ್ತು ಅವರ ಕುಟುಂಬದವರಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದಂತೆ ಆರೋಗ್ಯ ಸೌಲಭ್ಯಗಳನ್ನು ಒದಗಿಸುವ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ ಆದೇಶ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ ಎಫ್‌ಡಿ 2/3/04 ದಿನಾಂಕ

ಓದಲಾಗಿದೆ.

2/3/04

12/04

Before the Government of Mysore.

Appeal No. 91 of 1903 04

Appellant.

Vs.

Respondent.

Seshagiriachar
(dead)
Venkatesa Bettu Bayi
alias Rama Bayi abbaiah
& 11 others Entitled -

1. Gode Bayi
2. Nijavanda Rao
minor by guardian
Bhima Rao.

Claim to the archakship of Sri Anjaneya
Swamy temple at Hanasoge Yedatore Taluk

Date of hearing 4. 4. 04,

The parties / advocates
to Read, vide Order Sheet
attached in Record

Heard the parties -

Reserve the Order
for orders -

C.

4-4-04.

11/4/04. Order pronounced,
~~Both sides heard~~
We have read and
to study the record the - Order
reserved - C.

11/4/04 -

11.4.1904

Vide order on a
separate sheet
SUR

31GCPB—500—10 3-03.

సన్ 1903 - 1904 నీవరుషమున 7/ నీలకొండాయపల్లి
వాస్తవ్యుడగు కాంచనాచారులవారు 183/ రూపాయలు
వెల్లకాలపు కట్టడమగు రాతిబండ్లకాల్వకు తగిన మరమ్మతు
చేయించి యీ కాల్వ క్రింద, నున్న పొలములకు
తుంగభద్రా నదినుండి నీరు పారుటకు
కూర్చిన తాళపత్రశాసనమును కొండయాచారి వ్యవహారమున
సేవ చేయుటకొరకు నిచ్చుచున్నది.



Letter no. 101 dated 31st October 1903, from the Deputy Commissioner, Mysore District, to the Secy. to Govt. Muzrai Department.

Rec'd 9/5/04

No. Pol 1415 dt 9.5.04.

Retransferred with draft Council decision, endorsement, and the entire record to the Secretary to Govt., Muzrai Department, for issue.

By order,

for Secretary to Govt.
Rev: & General Depts.

9th May 1904

SVR

a pencil mark
P.P in the left hand corner
of the decision means that
the decision is to be printed
as well as published in Part IV
of the Mysore Gazette among
the official papers.

9/3/04

Before the Govt of H.H
the Maharaja of Mysore

Appeal no 91 of 1903 04

Appellant

Seshagiri ashar
(dead)
his widow Pitha Bayi
alias Rama Bayi appears
and is substituted.

Respondents

1. Gothu Bayi
2. Yeswanta Rao
minors by guardian Bhima Rao

Subject

Second appeal against the decree of the Munsif Nasik Court Comm. Mysore District, decreeing the Respondents, the Pujaship of the Anjaneyaswamy temple at Hanasoge, Yedatore Taluk, with the Inam land attached to it

---

The facts of the case appear sufficiently from the following

Argt for the appt
Hon 1st & 2nd Counsellors
29/4/04

Admd
29/4/04

Decision.

This is a dispute in connection with the Puja haq of the Anjaneyaswami Temple at Hanasoge, with the Inam land attached to it. The haq in question originally belonged to one Balachar who died some 60 or 70 years ago. He had a brother by name Koneracher who pre-deceased him leaving behind him two minor daughters named Krishnabayi and Rangubayi. Balachar had no children. He brought up his orphan nieces and married them to one Krishnachar and Subbannachar respectively. Both the parties to this suit claim under a gift from Balachar. They are however at variance as to the nature of the gift, one side, viz, the Plaintiff, alleging that the gift was in favor of Krishnachar alone and for his own benefit, and the other, viz, the Defendant, contending that it was in favor of both Krishnachar and Subbannachar, and not on their own account but on behalf of their wives, the nieces of the donor. The Amildar and the Assistant Commissioner accepted the former version and rejected the latter. In the result the suit was allowed. Hence this ap-peal.

2. For a proper understanding and appreciation of the case, the relationship between the parties is shewn in the geneological tree below:



3. The Plaintiff relies upon a deed of gift dated 1835 which is alleged to have been supressed by the other side and of which therefore he produces a copy. The genuineness of this document is impugned and has not been satisfactorily established. Reliance ~~was~~ is placed upon the order of Government in Appeal No: 188 of 1892-93 in which a reference has been made to a gift in favor of Krishnachar, but it appears clear that that reference cannot have the force of a finding, occurring as it does, not in the body of the decision but in the resume of the facts of the case. It cannot moreover affect the Defendant who was not a party to that proceeding. Certain statements made on diverse occasions by Krishnabayi are next relied on, but the Government are of opinion that there is nothing in those statements to justify the contention based upon them. They do not necessarily show that the gift was one made either in Krishnachar's sole name or for his own benefit. The Defendant cannot moreover be held bound by them or by the Karar executed by Krishnabayi to Anantachar in 1879. The conduct of the Defendant's husband Seshigiriachar is said to militate against the Defendant's present assertion, but here too Government are unable to agree with the authorities below. Krishnabayi undoubtedly had an interest in the subject matter of this litigation and the fact that she was assisted by Seshigiriachar in the conduct of certain proceedings connected with the assertion of that interest and in the performance of puja in the temple does not show that the latter had himself no interest in the haq or that he was estopped from asserting it. Lastly, certain Jri Inamati accounts have been relied upon as evidence of Krishnachar's exclusive ownership. In the view, however, that Government have taken of the case, these accounts cannot be accepted as con-

conclusive evidence, contradicted as they are by an earlier account, the authenticity of which they see no reason to question.

4. And now coming to the case set up by the Defendant, Government find that, in addition to the evidence which will be referred to later on, the balance of probabilities is quite in its favor. Balachar had no interest in Krishnachar except as the husband of one of his nieces, and he was not therefore likely to have given away his property to him to the detriment not only of that niece but also of the other niece. This disposition evidenced by the deed of gift relied upon by the Defendant is a perfectly natural one. Balachar was anxious that the haq should not pass out of the family and he accordingly gave it to both these girls at the time of their marriage with the condition attached that, in the event of one of them dying without male issue, her half share should pass to the other. As regards the evidence, Government are satisfied that the document comes from proper custody and that it has all the appearance of a genuine instrument. Being a very old document, the law presumes its genuineness. It is engrossed upon a stamp paper expressly purchased for the purpose. Its existence was referred to in a deposition given by Krishnabayi so far back as 5/2/1889. Again, a plaint filed by herself and Seshigiriachar on 8/9/1891 makes mention of it. The Assistant Commissioner is in error in suspecting that it must have come into existence in 1893 when the case between Krishnabayi and Shamachar was before Government. The gift in favor of both the nieces represented by their husbands has been expressly mentioned in the marginal note to the Jari Inamati account for the year 1831. There is nothing suspicious about this note. It is the same handwriting as the rest of the account and

and its age and appearance must be given due weight. The only thing that could be said against it is that the copy maintained in the Huzur Records does not contain a similar note. Government do not however attach much importance to this circumstance, inasmuch as the last mentioned paper does not profess to be a verbatim copy of the original. It is shorter and less descriptive, and this is not the only shara which is found in the original but is absent in the copy. It is noteworthy that even the admitted gift of certain Bhatamanyam lands to Subbannachar in 1831 which is referred to in the original by a marginal shara has not found a corresponding place in the said copy, or even in the copy for the two subsequent years. A list of variations between the Huzur copy and the Taluk original has been prepared and attached to this decision. The conduct of Seshigiriachar throughout seems to show that he always regarded himself as the owner of a half share in the haq in question. Neither the possession of Krishnachar who died in 1876 nor that of Krishnabayi who died in 1896 has been shewn to have been adverse to Rajubayi or her son Sheshigiria Char. Under these circumstances, Government have no hesitation in coming to the conclusion that the Plaintiff has not substantiated his case while the Defendant has.

7. There remains the question whether in spite of the above finding the suit is entitled to succeed. Government are of opinion that it is not. The Plaintiff can only claim as a lineal descendant of Krishnachar. But that individual had no title of his own to the haq, having merely been his wife's agent in regard to her half share which on the death of that woman without male issue passed under the terms of the gift to her sister's son, the Defendant's husband Seshi-

Seshigiriachar, who already owned the other half; and on the latter's demise the whole descended to the Defendant under the law of succession. The law recognizes gifts of this kind, i.e., gifts accompanied by a condition that the property should pass to another in a particular event, vide Mayne's Hindu Law, 5th. Edition, para 350. That being so, it follows that the Defendant's title is unassailable and that the Plaintiff's suit should be thrown out.

9. The appeal is accordingly allowed and the suit dismissed.

C Ramaswamy
18/4/04
B Venkatasami
18/4/1904

No. 3572
Mis 3.7.5-99.

Copy of the above is forwarded to the Dy. Commissioner, Mysore District, together with the records received with his letters Nos. 309 and 101 dated the 30th May and the 31st October 1903

By 20-5-04

Secy. Municipal Dept.

S. MR
29/4/04

[illegible] 1903-04 [illegible] 91.

Nos 3573 & 3574 of 1905 [illegible]
[illegible] 23.5.99

[illegible]

1. [illegible]

2. [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 1835 [illegible] 1876 [illegible] 1896 [illegible] 1831 [illegible]

C. 6/5/04

7 5 1904

[illegible]

[illegible] 1835 [illegible] 1831 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 1835 [illegible]

[illegible] 1892-93 [illegible]

[illegible]

ಸಂಪಾದಕರಿಗೆ ಪತ್ರ

ಮಾನ್ಯರೇ,

ಕಳೆದ ಕೆಲವು ವಾರಗಳಿಂದ ನಿಮ್ಮ ಪತ್ರಿಕೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಕಟವಾಗುತ್ತಿರುವ ಕಾವೇರಿ ನದಿ ನೀರು ಹಂಚಿಕೆ ಕುರಿತ ಚರ್ಚೆಯನ್ನು ಗಮನಿಸಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಈ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವು ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟನೆಗಳನ್ನು ನೀಡಲು ಬಯಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಕಾವೇರಿ ಜಲ ನಿರ್ವಹಣಾ ಪ್ರಾಧಿಕಾರವು ಜೂನ್ ತಿಂಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಬಿಡುಗಡೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾದ ನೀರಿನ ಪ್ರಮಾಣವನ್ನು ನಿಗದಿಪಡಿಸಿದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಮಳೆಯ ಕೊರತೆಯಿಂದಾಗಿ ಜಲಾಶಯಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ನೀರಿನ ಮಟ್ಟ ಗಣನೀಯವಾಗಿ ಕಡಿಮೆಯಾಗಿದೆ. ಇಂತಹ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಎಲ್ಲ ಪಾಲುದಾರರೂ ಸಹಕಾರ ತತ್ತ್ವದಡಿ ಕಾರ್ಯನಿರ್ವಹಿಸಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ.

ಕೆಲವರು ಈ ಹಂಚಿಕೆಯನ್ನು ಅನ್ಯಾಯವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದರೆ ಇದು ಕೇವಲ ಒಂದು ರಾಜ್ಯದ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಯಲ್ಲ, ಇಡೀ ಜಲಾನಯನ ಪ್ರದೇಶದ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆ. ಎಲ್ಲರೂ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ತ್ಯಾಗ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಮಾತ್ರ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆ ಬಗೆಹರಿಯಲು ಸಾಧ್ಯ.

ಧನ್ಯವಾದಗಳೊಂದಿಗೆ,
ಕೆ. ಎಸ್. ಮಂಜುನಾಥ್

Yours faithfully,

Encl: 1.

Copy to:

1. [illegible]

BEFORE THE GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE.

Appeal No. 91 of 1903-04.

Appellant	*Versus*	Respondents
Seshagiriachar (dead), his widow Pillubayi *alias* Ramabayi appears and is substituted.		1. Gothubayi 2. Yesvanta Rao, minors, by guardian Bhima Rao.

Subject.

Second appeal against the decree of the Muzrai Assistant Commissioner, Mysore District, decreeing to the respondent, the puja hak of the Anjaneyaswami temple at Hanasoge, Yedatore Taluk, with the Inam land attached to it.

The facts of the case appear sufficiently from the following :—

Decision.

This is a dispute in connection with the puja hak of the Anjaneyaswami temple at Hanasoge, with the Inam land attached to it. The hak in question originally belonged to one Balachar, who died some 60 or 70 years ago. He had a brother by name Koneriachar, who predeceased him leaving behind him two minor daughters named Krishnabayi and Rangubayi. Balachar had no children. He brought up his orphan nieces and married them to one Krishnachar and Subbannachar, respectively. Both the parties to this suit claim under a gift from Balachar. They are however at variance as to the nature of the gift, one side, *viz.*, the plaintiff, alleging that the gift was in favor of Krishnachar alone and for his own benefit, and the other, *viz.*, the defendant, contending that it was in favor of both Krishnachar and Subbannachar and not on their own account but on behalf of their wives, the nieces of the donor. The Amildar and the Assistant Commissioner accepted the former version and rejected the latter. In the result the suit was allowed. Hence this appeal.

2. For a proper understanding and appreciation of the case, the relationship between the parties is shown in the geneological tree below :—


Balachar, brother Koneriachar,
Krishnabayi, (married Krishnachar)
Rangubayi, (married Subbannachar)
Seshagiriachar, (defendant) [died during the pendency of this appeal, leaving a widow, the present appellant].
Krishnachar, brother Babachar, (married Krishnabayi but had no children)
Anantachar
Shamachar
Adopted son plaintiff Yesvanta Rao (Respondent.)

3. The plaintiff relies upon a deed of gift dated 1835 which is alleged to have been suppressed by the other side and of which therefore he produces a copy. The genuineness of this document is impugned and has not been satisfactorily established. Reliance is placed upon the order of Government in Appeal No. 188 of 1892-93 in which a reference has been made to a gift in favor of Krishnachar, but it appears clear that reference cannot have the force of a finding, occurring as it does, not in the body of the decision, but in the resume of the facts of the case. It cannot moreover affect the defendant who was not a party to that proceeding. Certain statements made on diverse occasions by Krishnabayi are next relied on, but the Government are of opinion that there is nothing in those statements to justify the contention based upon them. They do not necessarily show that the gift was one made either in Krishnachar's *sole name* or for his *own benefit*. The defendant cannot moreover be held bound by them or by the kabar executed by Krishnabayi to Anantachar in 1879. The conduct, of the defendant's husband Seshagiriachar is said to militate against the defendants present assertion, but here too Government are unable to agree with the authorities below. Krishnabayi undoubtedly had an interest in the subject-matter of this litigation and the fact that she was assisted by Seshagiriachar in the conduct of certain proceedings connected with the assertion of that interest and in the performance of puja in the temple, does not show that the latter had himself no interest in the hak or that he was estopped from asserting it. Lastly, certain Jari Inamti accounts have been relied upon as evidence of Krishnachar's exclusive ownership. In the view, however, that Government have taken of the case, these

accounts cannot be accepted as conclusive evidence, contradicted as they are by an earlier account the authenticity of which they see no reason to question.

4. And now coming to the case set up by the defendant, Government find that in addition to the evidence which will be referred to later on, the balance of probabilities is quite in its favor. Balachar had no interest in Krishnachar except as the husband of one of his nieces, and he was not therefore likely to have given away his property to him to the detriment not only of that niece, but also of the other niece. The disposition evidenced by the deed of gift relied upon by the defendant is a perfectly natural one. Balachar was anxious that the hak should not pass out of the family and he accordingly gave it to both these girls at the time of their marriage with the condition attached that, in the event of one of them dying without male issue her half share should pass to the other. As regards the evidence, Government are satisfied that the document comes from proper custody and that it has all the appearance of a genuine instrument. Being a very old document, the law presumes its genuineness. It is engrossed upon a stamp paper expressly purchased for the purpose. Its existence was referred to in a deposition given by Krishnabayi so far back as 5th February 1889. Again a plaint filed by herself and Seshagiriachar on 8th September 1891 makes mention of it. The Assistant Commissioner is in error in suspecting that it must have come into existence in 1893 when the case between Krishnabayi and Shamachar was before Government. The gift in favor of both the nieces represented by their husbands has been expressly mentioned in the marginal note to the Jari Inamti account for the year 1831. There is nothing suspicious about this note. It is in the same handwriting as the rest of the account and its age and appearance must be given due weight. The only thing that could be said against it is that the copy maintained in the Huzur records does not contain a similar note. Government do not however attach much importance to this circumstance, inasmuchas the last mentioned paper does not profess to be a *verbatim* copy of the original. is shorter and less descriptive, and this is not the only *shara* which is found in the iginal but is absent in the copy. It is noteworthy that even the admitted gift of rtain Bhatawanyam lands to Subbannachar in 1831 which is referred to in the iginal by a marginal *shara*, has not found a corresponding place in the said copy, even in the copy for the two subsequent years.

5. The conduct of Seshagiriachar throughout seems to show that he always egarded himself as the owner of a half share in the hak in question. Neither the ossession of Krishnachar who died in 1876 nor that of Krishnabayi who died in 1896 as been shown to have been adverse to Rangubayi or her son Seshagiriachar.

6. Under these circumstances, Government have no hesitation in coming to the conclusion that the plaintiff has not substantiated his case while the defendant has.

7. There remains the question whether in spite of the above finding the suit is entitled to succeed. Government are of opinion that it is not. The plaintiff can only claim as a lineal descendant of Krishnachar. But that individual had no title of his own to the hak, having merely been his wife's agent in regard to her half share which, on the death of that woman without male issue, passed under the terms of the gift to her sister's son the defendant's husband Seshagiriachar, who already owned the other half; and on the latter's demise the whole descended to the defendant under the law succession. The law recognizes gifts of this kind, *i.e.*, gifts accompanied by a condition that the property should pass to another in a particular event, *vide* Mayne's Hindu Law, 5th Edition, para 350. That being so, it follows that the defendant's title is unassailable and that the plaintiff's suit should be thrown out.

8. The appeal is accordingly allowed and the suit dismissed.

No. 3572—Muz. F. 5-99, dated Bangalore, 20th May 1904.

Copy of the above is forwarded to the Deputy Commissioner, Mysore District, together with the records received with his letters Nos. 309 and 101, dated the 30th May and the 31st October 1903.

"Dft"

Offg. Secy., Muzrai Dept.

Exd—C.R.

IS G

THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE

MUZRAI

PROCEEDINGS

Dated 20th May 1904

No. 3572
Muz. F. 5-99

Passing orders in the matter of the puja hak of the Anjaneyaswami temple at Hanasoge, Yedatore Taluk.

SPG—8-6-01—200

MYSORE GOVERNMENT
3053.
MUSEUM

Submitted

These copies may be granted according to Hon. Rules

1/6/64

Ref: please

1/6/64

ಸರ್ 1903-4ನೇ ಇಸವಿ ನಂಬರು.

ವಾದಿ.

ಪ್ರತಿವಾದಿ.

ರೆವರಿಗೆ.

ಬರಸಿಕೊಟ್ಟ ವಕಾಲತ್‌ನಾಮೆ.

ಈ ಮೊಕದ್ದಮೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ನನ್ನಪರವಾಗಿ ಕೋರ್ಟಿಗೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗಿ ಅರ್ಜಿ ವಗೈರೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ವಿವಾದಿಸಿ ಪೈಸಲ್ ಹೊಂದತಕ್ಕ ಬಗ್ಗೆ, ಮತ್ತು ನನಿಗೆ ಸಲ್ಲತಕ್ಕ ಕಿಲ್ಲು ಮೊಬಲಗು ಡಿಕ್ರಿ ಮೊಬಲಗು ದಸ್ತೈವಜು ವಸ್ತೈರೆ ತೆಗದುಕೊಂಡು ರಸೀದಿ ಕೊಡುವದಕ್ಕೂ ಸಹಾ ತಮಿಗೆ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೀನೆ. ಅದ್ದರಿಂದ ತಾವು ನನಿಗೋಸ್ಕರ ಕೋರ್ಟಿಗೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗಿ ನಡಿಸುವ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಕೆಲಸಗಳೆನ್ನು ನಾನು ಖುದ್ದು ಇದ್ದು ನಡಿಸಿದಂತೆ ಒಪ್ಪಲು ಇದರಿಂದ ಬದ್ದನಾಗಿರುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ತಾರೀಖು 21 ನೇ ಜೂನ್ 1904 ನೇ ಇಸವಿ } ರಾಜು

ಈ ಮೊಕ್ತ್ಯಾರ್‌ನಾಮೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟವರು ನನಿಗೆ ಪರಿಚಯಸ್ಥರು. ನನ್ನ ಸಮಕ್ಷವು ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ರುಜುವಾಡಿ ದ್ದಾರೆಯಾದ್ದರಿಂದ ನಾನು ಸರಟನ್ನೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೀನೆ.

ಅಂಗೀಕರಿಸಿ ಇರುತ್ತೇನೆ.

H. Krishnamurthy Rao
Advocate
M. Ramakrishnaiah

ಈ ಫಾರಂ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಶಿವಿ ಚಿಕ್ಕಪೇಟೆ ಪಾಪ್‌ಕೀಪರ ಯಲ್ಲಾ ನಂಜುಂಡಪ್ಪನವರಲ್ಲಿ ಸಿಕ್ಕುತ್ತದೆ.

S. G. N. PRESS, COTTON PETTA BANGALORE—CITY.

MYSORE GOVERNMENT
MUZRAI
3162

[illegible]

MYSORE GOVERNMENT
3239
3235
MUZRAI SECRETARIAT

4/6/04

ಮುಜರಾಯಿ ಆಯುಕ್ತರ ಕಾರ್ಯಾಲಯ
ಕಾಳೇಶ್ವರ ದೇವಸ್ಥಾನಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದ
ನಾನು ಅನ್ಯಾಧಿಕೃತ ವ್ಯಕ್ತಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ನೀಡಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ
ಕಾರ್ಯಾಲಯದ ಸಿಬ್ಬಂದಿಗಳು ಮಾತ್ರ ಇರುತ್ತಾರೆ
ಇಂತಿ ಆಯುಕ್ತರು

ನಾವು ಕಾಳೇಶ್ವರ ದೇವಸ್ಥಾನದ ಪ್ರಧಾನ ಅರ್ಚಕರು
ಆಗಿದ್ದು ನಮ್ಮ ಕುಟುಂಬದವರು ಸುಮಾರು ೨೦೦ ವರ್ಷಗಳಿಂದ
ಈ ದೇವಸ್ಥಾನದಲ್ಲಿ ಪೂಜಾ ಕೈಂಕರ್ಯಗಳನ್ನು ನೆರವೇರಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು
ಬರುತ್ತಿರುತ್ತೇವೆ. ಈ ದೇವಸ್ಥಾನಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದಂತೆ
ಕೆಲವು ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಗಳಿದ್ದು ಅವುಗಳನ್ನು ಬಗೆಹರಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲು
ಕಳೆದ ಮೂರು ವರ್ಷಗಳಿಂದ ಆಯುಕ್ತರ ಕಾರ್ಯಾಲಯಕ್ಕೆ
ಅಲೆದಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಆದರೆ ಇಲ್ಲಿಯವರೆಗೂ ಯಾವುದೇ
ಪ್ರಯೋಜನವಾಗಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆಯುಕ್ತರ ಕಾರ್ಯಾಲಯದ
ಸಿಬ್ಬಂದಿಗಳು ಸಹ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಸ್ಪಂದಿಸುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ
ಆಯುಕ್ತರ ಕಾರ್ಯಾಲಯದ ಸಿಬ್ಬಂದಿಗಳು ಮಾತ್ರ ಇರುತ್ತಾರೆ
ಎಂಬ ಸೂಚನಾ ಫಲಕವನ್ನು ಕಾರ್ಯಾಲಯದ ಮುಂಭಾಗದಲ್ಲಿ
ಹಾಕಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಅನುಮತಿ ನೀಡಬೇಕಾಗಿ ಕೋರಿಕೆ.
ಇಂತಿ ನಿಮ್ಮ ವಿಶ್ವಾಸಿ

ದಿನಾಂಕ 13/6/04

ರಮಾಕಾಂತ ಇಂಗುಡಿಯವರ
ಬಿನ್ನಹ

Mysore Dept

No. 4096

Muzi: F: 5-99.

[illegible]

[illegible] 13 [illegible] 3239 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 30-6-1904 [illegible]

[signature]

[signature]

Secretary

Muzi: Depart

[initials] 18/6/04

MYSORE GOVERNMENT
MUZRAI SECRETARIAT

Presented by

The Government of His Highness
the Maharaja of Mysore
Bangalore.

R A. No. 30 of 04-05

Petitioners :-
(1) Yeswantha Rao minor by guardian Bheema Rao.
(2) Gouda Bai widow of Shama Char 1st Plaintiff adopted father minor by guardian Bheema Rao.

~~Df~~

Counter Petitioner
Rama Bai widow of Seshagiriachar

The Petitioners abovenamed respectfully beg to prefer this Rev. Petition against the decision of the learned Councillors in Rev. appeal No 91 of 1903-04 dated 20th May '04 for the following among other reasons

(1) That the Pujah hak of the mukhya Prana Devaru temple of Hanasoge Yedatore Taluq belong to one Balachar who made a gift of it to his brothers' son-in-law one Krishna Char in 1835.

(2) That on the death of the said Krishnachar leaving his widow Krishna Bai the pujah used to be performed by the 1st Petitioners grand father Anantha Char who was the undivided nephew of the aforesaid Krishnachar

(3) That when the said Anantachar had performed the pujah for a period of three years disputes arose between him and Krishna Bai

candies of paddy out of the produce of the Inamti lands attached to the office and allow the said Krishnabai to be in enjoyment of the remaining produce.

(5) That after the death of the said Ananthachar his son Shamachar performed the pujah for a period of 7 or 8 years and afterwards the said Krishnabai petitioned to the Mysore authorities that her fathers son (the co-petitioners husband) should be nominated to perform the pujah in preference to the said Shamachar and thereupon the said Seshagiriachar was appointed for the place and refused the father of the 1st Petitioner the said Shamachar to a regular suit.

(6) That after the death of the said Shamachar and Krishnabai the petitioners filed a suit on the Mysore side to establish their right to succeed to the Inam which had been gifted to their ancestor Krishnachar before the Amildar of Yedatore Taluq and it was decreed in their favor.

(7) That on appeal the Mysore Assistant Commissioner of the Mysore Dist upheld the Lower Court Decree and dismissed the appeal prescribed by the Co-Petitioners' husband.

(8) That in second appeal the learned Councillors upset the Decrees of the Lower Courts on grounds which the petitioners submit require reconsideration as the order has the effect of depriving the petitioners of valuable properties and means of livelihood.

(9) That the last sentence of the aforesaid Karar of the year 1879 most clearly recites that the original Samad pertaining to the kuk and also the original deed of gift executed by Balachar in favor of Krishnachar were given over to the custody of Krishna Bai.

(10) That the possession of these two documents was given to her with a view to enforce strict obedience on the part of Anantha Char the executant of the Karar to the terms thereof and also to give the said Krishna Bai a hold over Anantha Char of the due performance of the pujah.

(11) That on 31.7.1883 before the Amildar of Yedatore she has deposed in clear terms that the kuk was gifted to her husband by her uncle in the original kukdar Balachar and that she has arranged for the performance of the pujah by her husbands' nephew Anantha Char on payment to him of 10 Candis of paddy

(12) That again on 27-6-84 the said Krishna Bai has deposed in unambiguous terms before the Amildar of Yedatore that the pujah kuk belong to her husband and that she was enjoying a greater portion of the produce

following the year in which the gift was made.

(14) That the original Karar having framed to the custody of Krishnabai as explained above she in collusion with her sisters son ie the Cr: Petitioners husband suppressed it and in its place concocted a deed of gift alleged to have been made by the said Balachar in favor of his neices Krishnabai and Rangubai

(15) That the fact is that the said Balachar made a gift of the Bhramadaya lands to his brothers 2° son-in-law ie the Cr: Counter petitioners father-in-law in the year 1881.

(16) That after the aforesaid Collusion between Krishnabai and Seshagirachar the said deed of gift relating to Bhramadaya lands alone was also suppressed and in its place the forged deed of gift of both Bhramadaya and devadaya lands Combined was brought into existence so as to give it an appearance of genuineness.

(17) That no mention is made either in the accounts maintained by government or in any sort of Government records of the forged deed of gift.

(18) That the forged deed of gift saw the

light of day for the first time in the year 1892 when Krishna Bai's Case against Shama Char was being argued before Councillor in Petition 188 of 1892-93.

(19) That the petitioners submit that the terms of the aforesaid forged deed themselves throw a great deal of suspicion as to its genuineness inasmuch as the clause that in the event of one of the donees dying issueless the other should take the whole lot is one which would hardly find a place in deeds of gift as are commonly executed by orthodox Hindus.

(20) That except in a marginal note of Jari Enamti account of 1832 of the Taluq of Arkalgud which is not found in a Copy of the Same account kept in the Dewans office there is no mention whatever in Government records.

(21) That the fact of Krishna Bais taking possession of the original deed of gift in favour of Petitioners' ancestor Krishnachar accounts for the non-production of the original by the petitioners in the original Court.

(22) That the learned Councillors have attached an undue value to some State-ments made by the ex: Petitioners husband in Some plaint filed by him

Krishnabai executing a Will and subsequently a deed of gift also in his favour (viz Ext 19)

(24) That the Petitioners most humbly submit that there is overwhelming evidence in support of their allegations before all the Courts while the cr: Petitioners allegations are not supported either by Government or private records.

(25) That the Government may be pleased to order an enquiry as to the genuineness or otherwise of the alleged deed of gift produced by the cr. Petitioners' husband for a finding by a Competent Civil Court and then finally decide the question.

(26) That the petitioners further submit that the Government may be pleased to refer the several intricate points of law for the opinion of the Chief Court.

(27) That the order of Government being final the petitioners pray that every Concession may be shown to them by giving them a hearing to represent their aspect of the case for favour of reconsideration.

(28) That the Petitioners further humbly

pray that this Hon'ble Government may be pleased to direct that the execution of the order appealed against be stayed pending the decision of the present petition

For these reasons the petitioners most humbly pray that this Hon'ble Government may be pleased to go through the entire records of the case and to set aside the order which has been passed depriving them of the right enjoyed by their family for a long period of years.

Bangalore.
June 20' 04

MYSORE GOVERNMENT
3382
MUZRAI SECRETARIAT

1903.04

From

To

Dated

Despatched

Received

General No.
No.

Enclosure No

Why were they not sent?

28/6/04

A. Venkata Rao

28/6/04 received in This office

All the papers ~~referred~~ were already sent. Draft docket Submitted

5/7/04 AV

To.

M. Shanga Rao Esq M.A.
Offg: Secretary to the Government
of Mysore in the Revenue Department.

Sir,

With reference to your official memo-
randum No 3572 dated 20th May 1904 returning
the records in connection with the Puje Kay of
Anjaneya swamy temple at Hansoge in
the Yedatore Taluk, I have the honour to
state that the exhibits marked L, M, O and
S are not forthcoming in the file and to
request that you will kindly order for
their despatch.

I have the honour to be
Sir,
Your most obedient servant

Chikkadevaraya
Dy Deputy Commissioner
Mysore District.

MUZRAI SECRETARIAT.

190 —190

From

L. ANANTASAMI RAO, Esq., B.A.,
Deputy Secretary to the Govt. of
H. H. the Maharaja of Mysore,
Muzrai Department.

To

The Deputy Commissioner
Mysore District.

Dated 9th July
Despatched 15th } July 1904
Received

General No. 278
Muzrai F. No. 5-99
Enclosure No. 1 File & Ltr.

His No. 334 dated 24th June
Calling for certain exhibits
in connection with the Enquiry
Case of the Sri Anjaneya
Swamy temple at Hansoge,
in the Yedatore Taluk.

~

Has the honor to state
that all the papers ~~Referred~~ Commented
to in the above have
with the case sent in this
already been sent with this
office No. 3542 of 13th June 1904

MGCPB—1000—21—1-04

dated 31st October 1903, which were in this office are herewith sent.

To.

"Ofb"

9/7/04

Mujrai Secretary.

9/7/04

416
RN

R. A. No. 3 of 04-05

The Secretary to the Government of
His Highness the Maharaja
of Mysore
General and Revenue Departments
Bangalore.

Rev. Mis. Petn no of 1903-04
Petition no of 1904-05.

Petitioners:-
(1) Yasawantha Rau
(2) Goorubai minors by guardian Bheema Rau } Petitioner

Vs

Pillu Bai alias Renuka Bai

Respondent

The Petitioners beg to state as follows:- Lay before the Committee 6-1-1905

(1) That the Petitioners have preferred a Review petition to this Hon'ble Government against the order of the Learned Councillors in As no 91 of 1903-1904

(2) That the Vs: Petitioner has putin a petition before the Deputy Commissioner of Mysore for the execution of the aforesaid order.

(3) That if the said execution is allowed the petitioners will be put to Considerable loss and inconvenience, and also the

circumstances the

petitioners most humbly pray that

this Hon'ble Government may be

pleased / to pass an order directing

that the execution of the order in

question may be stayed pending the

disposal of the Review petition.

Bangalore
July 15/04

[signature]

no. 272 in 27 files
M.7. no 5-99

Sri Anjaneya Swamy temple at Hanboge,
Jedatore Taluk

Forwarded to the Secretary to Govt,
Genl & Rev Dept, as the order against which
this review is brought was passed by a committee of
the council

Bangalore
15th May 1901

Sd/- L. Ananta Samy Rao
Secty. Genl & Rev depts

Urgent

1904-05.

From

Secy. to the Govt. of His Highness

the Maharaja of Mysore,

Genl. and Rev. Depts. Mung.

To

The Dy. Comm. Mysore

Dated 19th July 1904

Despatched

Received

General No. 335

No. 5-99

ENCLOSURE NO.

This Office No. 3572 dated 20th May 1904 Mung 7 5-99 Communicating the decn of Govt regarding the puja a huks of the Anjaneyaswamy temple at Hanasoge, Yedatore Taluk.

Has the honor to request that the list prepared in this Office of variations between the Mysore Copy & the Taluk Original of the Jari Inamti accounts of 1831 which has by an oversight accompanied the records forwarded with the above, may be returned to this Office at an early date.

By Order

19/7/04.

Secy. Mung Dept.



28/7/04

190 4 - 0 354 - 1911

From M. Kantaraj Urs
Dy Commissioner
Mysore District

To L. Anantasami Rao Esq
B.A.
Secretary to the Govt of
Mysore, Revenue Dept

Dated 25th July 1904

Despatched

Received

General No. 18
No.

Enclosure No one

Submitting the list prepared in your Off:- of variations between the Huzur Copy & the Official of the Jagir Taluks of 1883.

Respectfully submitted

28/7/04

Submitted
28/7/04

1157

O.M. No 638 Enc(2) — Rev.
29/8/1904.

Forwarded to the Secretary to Government of H.H. the Maharaja of Mysore General and Revenue Departments in Continuation of this Office O.M. No 272 dated 15th July 1904.

By order

4th August 1904

S. Anantasamy Rao
Secretary
Revenue Dept

I draw
9/V

MCCPB—50 teams—6 12 02

Dated Mysore 25th July 1904

From

L. Ananda Narayana Rao Esqr BA.

Secretary to the Government of Mysore

in the Mulgrai department.

To

Sir,

With reference to your docket

no. $\frac{335}{5\text{-}99}$ dated 19th July 1904 calling for the

list prepared in your office of variations

between the Huzur copy and the Taluk

original of the Jare Inam accounts

of 1831 and received with your no

$\frac{3572}{5\text{-}99}$ dated 20th May 1904, I have the

honor to submit herewith the list

called for

I have the honor to be

Sir,

Your Most obedient & Servant

L. Ananda Rao

Dy Commissioner

Mysore District

ನೋಟೀಸು.

~~ಜುಡಿಷಿಲ್ ಸಿರ್ಕಾ ಕಚೇರಿಯಿಂದ.~~

ರಿವಿಯೂ ಅರ್ಜಿ ನಂ 3

1904–905 ನೇ ಇಸವಿ ~~ಮೇಲ್ಮನವಿ~~ ಅಪೀಲು ನಂಬರು .....

ಯೆಮುದ್ ಅಪೀಲ್‌ದಾರ್
~~ಅಪೀಲು ಪ್ರತಿವಾದಿ~~
ಯೆದಪೋಕಿ ವಾಂಕಿಸ್ವಾಮಿ
ಸೋಲಸ್ರಾ ಮದಶೆಟ್ಟಿಪಾಳ್ಯ ಅಲಸೂರು
ಹಿಂದಿನ ರಮೋಲಾಂಯಿ ಪೆರುಸ್ಟ್
ವಿಲ್ಲುಲಾಂಯಿ.

~~ಅಪೀಲು ವಾದಿ~~
ಅಬೀದಾಸ್ತ್ರು.
1. ಯೆಶವಂತ್‌ರಾವ್
ತಾಮಷ್ಟರ್ ಪಬ್ಲಿಕ್ ಮಕ
2 ಸೋಮುಲಾಂಯಿ - ತಾಮಂಚೋತ್ರು
ಹಿಂದುಸಿ
ಮೈಸೂರ್ ನಗರ ನಿವಾಸಿಗಳಾದ ಪೆದ್ದಿಯುನ್
ಯೆದಪೋಕಿ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಪೆದವನಸೋಕಿಯಲ್ಲು
ಯಿರುವ ಬಿಲ್ಲೀಸ್ ಕೋರ್ಟು — ವಿಸ್ತರು.

ಯೆದಪೋಕಿ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಪೆದವನಸೋಕಿಯಲ್ಲು ಯಿರುವ ಲಂಚನೇಯದೇವರ
ಕೂಚಿ ಮತ್ತು ಇನಪಲ್ಲಿಪಂಚಂದ ಪೆಳ್ಳ ಇನಾಂಚಿಮೀನುಗಳು ಇವುಗಳ
ಕರ್ಷ್ಣ —

ಮೇಲಕಂಡ ~~ಅಪೀಲುದಾರು~~ ಅಬೀದಾರು ಗಾರಿನಿಯುನ್ ಚ್ಛೀಮಂ ವಿಸೆ —

ನೀನು ಗೌರ್ನ್‌ಮೆಂಟು ~~ಪಿಟ್ಟ, ಕ್ಟು ಪೆಪ್ಪುಟಿ ಪವಿಾಷನ್~~ ನರ ಪುಳುವಿ ನ ಮೇಲೆ ~~ಪುಜಾಸಿನೆ~~ ಗುಜರಾಯಿಸಿದ 1904 ನೇ ಇಸವಿ ಜೂನ್ ತಿಂಗಳ 20 ನೇ ಸುರುಳುವಿನ ~~ಅಪೀಲು~~ ರಿವಿಯ್ಯೂ ಅರ್ಜಿಯು, 1904 ನೇ ಇಸವಿ ನವೆಂಬರ್ 7 ನೇ ತಾರೀಖಿನ ದಿನದ ಮಧ್ಯಾಹ್ನ (ಯಿಪ್ಪಟ್ಟಿಂಚುನ್ನ) ಮೈಸೂರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ವಿಚಾರಣೆ ಮಾಡಲ್ಪಡುವುದರಿಂದ, ಆ ದಿನದ ಪೂರ್ವಾಹ್ನ 11 ಘಂಟೆಗೆ ನೀನು ಈ ಕಚೇರಿಗೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗಬೇಕು.

ಬತಾರೀಖು 1 ನೇ ಮಾಹೆ ನವೆಂಬರ್ — 1904

ನೇ ಇಸವಿ, ಮೊಕ್ಕಾಂ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು.

By Order,

[signature]
for Secretary,

MGCPB—1,000—24-2-03.

Appeal 54/65

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 1-9-04 [illegible]
1902 [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible]
3-9-04

[illegible]

104/134

[illegible] 2m3287.

[illegible]

(H)
ನಂಬರ್. R 1902 ದಿ 1st Sept 1937.

ಹುಬ್ಬಳ್ಳಿ ದಿವಾನ್ ಕಛೇರಿಯಿಂದ.

ಯಡಕೊಳ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಲಮಲ್ ದಾರ್ರಿಗೆ ಬರೆಸಿ

ಈ ಸುಹಿಸಿದ ನಿಡುಗರ ಆದಾಗಿ –

ಇಲ್ಲಿನ ಸ್ಟ 1904–905ನೇ ಇಸವಿ ~~ಕೆಮಿನ್ಯೂ ಆಫೀಸರ್~~ ಈವಿ ಯೂನಿಫಾರ್ಮ್ ನೇ ನಂಬರು

ಮೊಕದ್ದಮೆಯು ಕಷ್ಟಿಗಾರರು ಮೋರ್ಚ್ನಲ್ಲಿ ನಮೂದಾದವರ ಹೆಸರಿಗೆ ತಯಾರಾದ

ಎರಡು ನೋಟೀಸುಗಳನ್ನು ಇದರ ಹಿಂದೆ ರಹಾ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿರುತ್ತೆ. ಕ್ರಮ ಪ್ರಕಾರ

ಜಾರಿಯಿಂದ ಅನರ್ ನೋಟೀಸುಗಳನ್ನು ಕೂಡ್ಲೆ ಈ ಆಫೀಸಿಗೆ ವಾಪಸ್ ಕಳುಹಿಸತಕ್ಕದ್ದು.

ಬತಾರೀಖು / ನೇ ಮಾಹೆ ಸೆಪ್ಟೆಂಬರ್ 1904ನೇ

ಇಸವಿ, ದಿನ ಜಾಗಾ ಬೆಳಗಾವಿ ಗೆ

By Order,

Secretary.

MGCB -500--23 2-03.


MYSORE GOVERNMENT
24 SEP 1904
AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT

Before the Government of Mysore.

Review application ~~Appeal~~ No. 3 of 1904-05

~~Appellant~~. Vs. C. Petr:
Petitioners. Respondent.
1. Yeswanta Rao Ramabai alias
2. Gooda Bai Pillubai.
minors by guardian
Bheema Rao.

Dispute regarding the Puja hakk of the Ramaswami Temple at Hamasoge, Yedatore Taluk with the Inam land attached to it.

Date of hearing 28.9.04
Notice issued to Petr 1-9-04
The Petr being absent from the village the notice is reported to have been pasted on the door of his house
MR

CC
27.9.04.

Petitioners by Rao Rama Chandra Rao

Heard arguments.
Order reserved.
CC.
29/9/04.

29/9/04

MGCPB—500—10-3-03.

Muz: F: 5-99.

Government

MYSORE ~~DEWAN'S OFFICE~~

MUZRAI DEPARTMENT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

No. 1826 Rt.

The accompanying Petition No. 1505

~~dated~~ without date but received at ~~the~~ ~~Dewan's Office from~~ Camp Mysore on the 10th ultimo from Bhima Rao guardian of Yasvanta Rao of Hantoge in the Yedatore Taluk praying for the refund of excess Stamp Duty paid by him in appeal No. 10 of 99-00 ~~is forwarded, together with its enclosures, to the~~ on the file of the District Muzrai Officer, Mysore, is forwarded to the Deputy Commissioner, Mysore District for favour of disposal

By Order,

14/11/04

~~Deputy~~ Secretary

Muzrai Dept.

BANGALORE,
14-11-1904

No. 1827
14-11-04

Encl: Petition &c

15/11/04

MGCBP—500—19-6 02

Proceedings of the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore, Muzrai, dated 10th February 1905.

MUZRAI.

BEFORE THE GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE.

Review Application No. 3 of 1904-05.

Petitioners.

1. Yeswant Rao.
2. Gothu Baye, minors by guardian Bhima Rao.

Subject.

Application for a review of G. O. No. 3572-Muz. F.—5-99, dated the 20th May 1904, recognizing the claim of Pillu Baye *alias* Rama Baye to the Puja hak of the Anjaneyaswami temple at Hanasoge in the Yedatore Taluk and the Inam lands attached thereto.

Order.

This is an application for the review of Government decision in Appeal Case No. 91 of 1903-04.

The case hinges on the point whether or not the deed of gift by which Balachar made over the property in dispute to his nieces on certain conditions is genuine. The facts that it is engrossed on a stamp paper purchased for the purpose, that its existence has been referred to by Krishna Baye in her deposition in 1889, and again in the plaint presented by her and Seshagiriachar in 1891, clearly establish beyond a shadow of doubt that the document is a genuine one. Balachar could have no special interest in only one of his nieces, namely Krishna Baye, as the plaintiff now contends. To perpetuate in the family the Puja hak as well as the enjoyment of the Inam lands attached to the temple, it is natural he gifted away half share to each of his nieces on condition that it should pass into the hands of the surviving niece should the other die without male issue. After full consideration of the above and other facts adduced in the case, it was ordered that the defendant was entitled to the Puja hak as well as the Inam lands. Government see no reason to reconsider the decision in the absence of any fresh grounds, and direct that the review application be rejected.

No 2889—Mu. F. 5-99, DATED BANGALORE, 10TH FEBRUARY 1905.

Copy of the above is forwarded to the Deputy Commissioner of the Mysore District for information.

Draft— Sd/- [illegible]

Secy. to Govt., Muzrai Dept.

Exd.- [illegible].

1904-05

GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS
THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE

MUZRAI

PROCEEDINGS

Dated 10th February 1905

No. 2889
Muz. F. 5-99

Passing orders on the review petition of Yesavanta Rao and Gothu Baye, (minors) represented by guardian Bhima Rao, in the matter of the Puja hak of the Sri Anjaneyaswami temple at Hanasoge, Yedatore Taluk, and the Inam lands attached thereto.

SBP—21-2-05-280

ಮೈಸೂರು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದ ಶ್ರೀಮನ್ ಮಹಾರಾಜರವರ ಗೌರ್ನಮೆಂಟ್ ~~ಉನಕಲ್ ಪೆತ್ತ ಕೆನಿನ್ಯೂ~~ ಮುಜರಾಯಿ
ಸೆಕ್ರೆಟರಿಯವರ ಕಚೇರಿಯಿಂದ

ನಂಬರು. ~~2890~~ 2890 Enquire

ಮಾ|F ಹೊಸಕೋಟೆ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಹೊನಸೋನೆ ( ) ಗ್ರಾಮ
ದಿ 10-2-05.

ಬೆಟ್ಟಲರುಜ ಶ್ರೀ ಮಂಚಾರ್ಯರಿಗೆ ಮಳೆಯಿಲ್ಲದೆ ಬೆಳೆ ಕಂಪಿಯಾಗಿ ~~ಸೆ ಅಂಡಾಕುಲ್~~
ಚಿಂತೆಯಿಂದ ಬಿಸಿಯಾದ ಬಾಯಿ ಮೈನರ್ ಗಳು ಇವರು ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಗಾಬರಿ
ಯಾಗಿ ಬೀಮಸಂದ್ರಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದರು.

ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು, ಹೊನಸೋನೆ ಗ್ರಾಮದ ಸುತ್ತಮುತ್ತ ಅಂಚಿನಲ್ಲಿಯೆ
ವರ್ಷಪೂರ್ತಿ ಬೆಳೆಯುವ ಇನಾಮಿ ಜಮೀನಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಇನಾಂ ಮಿನಿಸ್ಟ್ರಿನ
ವು ಸುಬ್ಬಪ್ಪಯ್ಯ ~~ಪದಾಸ್ಥಾರಾಮ್~~ ಮಂಟಪವರಿಂದ ಮಾಡಲ್ಪಟ್ಟ
20-5-04 ನೇ ಮೆಮೋರಿಯಲ್ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ನವನ್ನು ವಿನಂತಿಸಿಕೊಂ
ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡರು.

I believe this is correct, will please satisfy yourself once more before issue - Q. 27-1-05

To Supdt of Inams I

27.1.05 Submitted. Please verify as per records in the Head Office and issue order. 28/1/05

28.1.05

~~ಹೆಚ್ಚುವರಿ ಇನಾಮಿನಸಂಬಂಧದಲ್ಲಿ ಮೊಕದ್ದಿರುವ ಹುಕುಮಿನ ಮೇರೆಗೆ~~ ನೀವು ಹುಜೂರಿಗ ಗುಜರಾಯಿ
ಸಿದ 20-6-04 ನೇ ಮೆಕ್ಕುಂ 33 ಂ ~~ಸ~~ ನೇ ನಂಬರಿನ ~~ಅಪೀಲ್~~ ಅರ್ಜಿಯನ್ನು ~~ಅದೇ ವಿಷಯವಾಗಿ~~
~~ಹೆಚ್ಚುವರಿ ಇನಾಮಿನಸಂಬಂಧವಾಗಿ ನಡವಳಿಕೆಯನ್ನು ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ಸಹಾ~~ ಪರಾಮರಿಸಿ
ಲಾಯಿತು.

ಬಾಳಾಚಾರ್ರು ~~ಅವರ~~ ತಂದೆ ವೆಂಕಟಸಿಂಗಯ್ಯನವರು ಬಹಳ ಕಾಲದಿಂದ
ಕೆಲವು ವಿಚಾರಗಳನ್ನಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ~~ಕಾಲಹರಣ~~ ವಿವಾದಮಾಡಿ ಜಮೀನನ್ನು ಕಳ
ಸಿಬಿಟ್ಟಿದ್ದರು. ಯಾವ ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನಾಗಲಿ ಮನಸ್ಸಿಗೆ ಹಚ್ಚಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದರು
ಎಂಥಾ ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾದ ವಿಷಯವಾಗಲಿ ಅಲ್ಪವೆ ಎಂಬ ಅಂಶವನ್ನು
ಮುಖ್ಯವೆಂದು ಭಾವಿಸಿ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರಾಧಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಯಿರುತ್ತಿದ್ದರು. ಯಾವಾಗಲೂ
ಶತ್ರುಗಳು ಬೀಳಿಸಲಿ ಅವರನ್ನು ಮುದಿನಿಂದ ಪರಿಚಯವಿಲ್ಲದಿದ್ದರೂ
ಪರಮೇಶ್ವರಪ್ಪನವರ ಪಕ್ಷವಿಚಾರವಿಲ್ಲದೆ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಅಂಗೈಯಲ್ಲಿ
ಹೊಲ, ಇಂಥಾ ಪಕ್ಷವಿಚಾರವುಳ್ಳವರಿಗೆ 1881 ನೇ ಇಸವಿಯಲ್ಲಿ

MUZRAI

1901

From The Secretary,
Muz Dept"

To
The Secretary
Genl & Rev Dept

Dated 27 April 1905
Despatched
Received
General No. 3966
Muzrai F. No. 5-99
Enclosure No.

Sir, With reference to
I am directed to forward herewith petns"
regd. nos. 3763 and 3882
from Bhima Rao, guardian
for the minors Yeswanta
Rao and Gothu Bai, allegin
that his wife to the Priz
Hak of the Sri Anjaneya
Swamy temple at Hanuse,
Yedatore Taluk was first
admitted by the Amildar on
a ten-Rupee stamp pape
and that, as per orders o

Genl. Rev nos 3572 dated 5-99 and 2889 dated 20th Aug 1904 and 10th Feby 905 respectively

MGCPB.—11-1-1901—1500

Rs 140/- worth of stamp paper, and praying that the excess amount ~~~~ of Rs 140/- actually paid by him may be refunded to him; and to request that, as ten-Rupee stamp paper is sufficient for preferring appeals in the Lower Courts, the excess sum, if any paid by the petr", may be reimbursed in communication with the Dy. Commr" of the Mysore Dist" and the fact intimated to this Office.

I have the honor etc.
Bpsoodsk.

dfd) 4/7 2214/05

Secretary.

Js 20/4/05

Put to the file"

As the case was decided by a Committee of Council, I am requisitioning also kindly placed the Committee's decision

ment of H. H. the Maharaja of Mysore.

GENL. & REV. SECRETARIAT.

REQUISITION FOR PAPERS.

Branch II Finance

S.H.

Part

Rev. File No. 5-99.

re-Pujaluk of Kuljaneyaswami at Hunasoge Yedalur Taluk.

Serial No.

* Collection No.

To be put up with Diary No. 273 of 1905

Signature

Date 26/7/05

Sd/-

H. Hayavadana Rao

To be filled in by the Record Room. G.R.S.

G. R. S. 70

Submitted

Please send the file

Abhinandan 27/7/05

From The Secretary, Inam Dept.

To The Secretary to Govt
General & Rev: Dept
Dated 27
Despatched July 1905 Bangalore
Received
General No. 591
No. 5-99
Enclosure No. 1 file

Has the honor to
forward herewith
Inam file no- 5-99
re Anjaneyaswami
Temple at Hansoge in the
Gadatore Taluk as
per requisition dt 26th
June 1905 from the Supdt
of the Financial Branch
C.R.s and to request

done w/Mo.

RSO

Dft 21/7/05

Secretary:

21/7/05

GOVERNMENT
824
16 8.05.
MUZRAI SECRETARIAT
Regd.-

Proceedings of the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.

Correspondence ensuing with letter No. [illegible] dated 19th July 1905, from the Deputy Commissioner of [illegible] District, regarding the petitions of [illegible] for the refund of Rs. [illegible] being the amount of court fee levied [illegible] in connection with the [illegible] suit pending before the [illegible] Assessor in Mysore City.

Order No. H 1125-6 dated Bangalore, 16th August 1905.

S.R 110-04-4

The amount of court fee [illegible] be refunded accordingly in each case, the Deputy Commissioner, with reference to the petition of [illegible] for relief, observes that the application is, however, filed in contravention of [illegible] Regulation [illegible] of 1894 and should be rejected. The prayer for refund is therefore [illegible], but the petitioners [illegible] that [illegible] on account of the [illegible] of the suits [illegible] case.

J. Satyanarayanachetty
for Secretary.

The Deputy Commissioner [illegible] Mysore.

[illegible] Order No. [illegible] dated 16th August 1905.

For information and necessary action.

Mr. Rice.

file

This may be filed
31/8/05

From

Secy. to the Govt. of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore, Genl. and Rev. Dept

To

The Secretary to the Govern-ment of H.H. the Maharaja of Mysore in the Muzrai Department.

Dated

Despatched 26 August 1905.

Received

General No. H 1369
No.

Enclosure No. 1 file

Has the honour to return herewith Muzrai file No.5-99, re the Puja hak of the Sri Anjaneyaswami temple at Hanasoge, Yedatore Taluk, received with his docket No.591 dated the 27th July 1905.

By Order

For Secretary.

OFFICE OF THE PRIVATE SECRETARY TO
HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE.

No. 523/1

Mysore 24th Aug 1906

MYSORE GOVERNMENT
1173
MUZRAI SECRETARIAT

Petition as shown below, to His Highness the Maharaja, is transferred to the Secretary to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore, Muzrai Department, Bangalore, for disposal.

No. 301 of 06-07.

The case was disposed of originally by the Council Court. Send to the Secy, G & R Deptt

By Order,

I. C. S.
Private Secretary
to H. H. The Maharajah of Mysore.

ಶಿಫಾರಸಿನ ಮೇರೆಗೆ ಸಹಾಯಕ ಶಿಕ್ಷಕರುಗಳನ್ನು
ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡುವ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನಿಯಮಾವಳಿ —
ಸಲಹೆಗಾರರನ್ನು ಆಯ್ಕೆ ಮಾಡುವ ಬಗ್ಗೆ

Draft
(Commission)

By order

27/9/06

Secretary to Govt

No. 190 Rs 25/9/06

Merge as before

Copy is forwarded with the request
to proceed in conformity of Govt Rule
No ~~37~~ 3572 of 20th inst/May/06.

By order

Rs
25/9/06

Deputy Secretary

GOVT

2741

30.11.06

30/11/06

I

II

A1

IV

7/12/06

[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible] 1899-900 [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

V 1892-98 [illegible] 18[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

VI [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

VII

VIII

7/12/06

[illegible]

IX [illegible]

ಕಲಂ 26-11-06

ಆರೋಪಿಯ ಸಹಿ ಅಥವಾ ಗುರುತಿನ ಬೆರಳಚ್ಚು

ಸಾಕ್ಷಿ ಹೇಳಿಕೆಯನ್ನು ಓದಿ ಹೇಳಲಾಗಿದೆ

X

ಸಾಕ್ಷಿ ಹೇಳಿಕೆಯನ್ನು ಓದಿ ಹೇಳಲಾಗಿದೆ

No. 3106 B/8 12.6.06

శ్రీ మంచు శ్రీనివాసం అంబిరవరగ
వర్ధిమం చేవలు మిరాలు ఇ.లంచి
యుంచ
అడ్రసింగ్ శ్రీనివాసం కుడన మీంల్లాసోలులు
రువయుతవంశరాలమశా-
నేవులు మీంగిశాంచిలర్థిశిమం
కు ఓ ము ప్ర్ గు
శ్రమాళనేనంశేలు అజ్ఞాపించంగరిన లం
ంబంకలు -
కనమీంల్లాశియుల్లు ంబంలవల్రంచ
ంబస్తాంబు చేల్వసిస్తినవ లుశ్రద్ధనాలులుశ్రీలు
దరబుల్వసీల్లుచ ంబంచేమిశ్రలు ంబంగిశాంధి
చేనిందశీంబుల్ధనాంబంశాలవ లు శ్రద్ధిన
శ్రీనీవు శ్రందశీవ్వు లుజ్ఞాపిరన్ధశీశాలవ

~~శ్రీలు అజ్ఞాపిరన్ధశీశాలవ~~ శీవ్వుంగరశీ
~~శ్రీవ్వుంగరశీ~~
శీమళ 1902 శీనీవు లలంశాంర్తశాల్లు రలవన్ధి
శ ఇంబంశిస్రాలర్థిగా ంబస్తాంబు శ్రీ 10 శాలాం
గా శ్రీమలవడ్డా.

By order &c
A. L. Narasimha
Secretary Committee
Vellore

7/12/06

MYSORE GOVT. MUSEUM
2903

11/12/06

8th Dec 1906

14/12/06

VII

VI

V

IV

VIII

VIII A

IX

XI

X

RECEIVED
3248
5/1/07
NAI SEC

[illegible]

III

[illegible]

V

I

VII

VIII

XI

మైసూర్ శ్రీమణిమి హారాజు రాజాసాడిల్ల ఛిహుద్దేర
శ్రీకృష్ణ రాజవడియరవర పంహాధిన్ని ద్రానంగళుగా
ఎడకోరి కాలుస్లాక్ చొండ్డిహనసినాగిరంయుల్లశువ కాళ్ళ వీరాచార్య
మిగయుగవంత రాంయునువినంకుళిపూర్వకబ్బిడికొళ్ళువ్యవేగనంద

పిదవియు ఈలూరు శ్రీరంగనేరయుస్వామి దేవస్థానగ
ళ్ళు చేయుహుక్కిన మిక్కిలు అదక్కేశేరిద ఇనాంగు మీరసుగళ విస్వాసార్హ
మొంబో విళయుపారి 21-8-06రల్లిన్ని అదక్కే లగత్తిసిరువ నిక్కే అజీనగ
కొపిరంయున్నసన్నిధానక్కే గుజురాయిసికొండిద్దను.

అదక్కేగనన్నిధానదింద ఇదక్కే లగత్తిసిరువ 24-8-06నే
301 నేసంబర్ క్రుక్కుం అర్ప్పణెయంతూరంయికు.

అదరంతే మీరు రాంస్కవిళిసిరన్ని కేళికొండుదక్కే
1906నేసెప్టంబర్ 28నే మళుర్ం 1902నేసంబర్ క్రుక్కుం అర్ప్పణెమాడిరువ
సన్నిధిగే ఇదసాగి ఇదరకొండ లగత్తిసికుత్తేనే.

రాజాకాడిక్కువ కారణగళు నన్న అజీరంయిరుంద రల్లదే
నమూదిద్దాగాగి నన్న అరువాలన్ను చిక్కెక్కే తందుకొళ్ళదే
అజీరంయన్ను కిరస్థిసికుత్తిరుంద, ఈగలూ చీవర్ణక్కే లోపగ
ళిరతక్కర్ర్యక్కు మిన్న అర్ప్పణే మాడిట్టిరుత్తారే.

ఆదుదిరంద మహారాజ్ఞిగళు మిద్దువిరాంబరిరయుం
నన్న అరువాలన్ను చిర్యజిక్కెక్కే తందుకొండుసకారరవేగవా
గిక్కేగళందు భూవిసిరువనగే అన్యాయవాగి కానడ్డుండ

నా దిష్టి విశే న్యాయవాది ఇన్‌సాఫ్ దంపుపాలసుబ్బిక్కింది
మహాసన్నిధాన మేస్మృతిని యుభయుభక్తిగళిందబిట్టి
కీకూళ్మక్కే నేమహాస్వామి. అయ్యశంకరంతన రుజు

కారిఖు 18నే అక్టోబర్ 1907నెయిస్వ
రునసూత్ర. ఎడకేరి కాల్మాకు.

OFFICE OF THE PRIVATE SECRETARY TO
HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE.
Mysore 29th October 1907.

No. 1077

Petition as shown below, to His Highness the Maharaja, is transferred to the Secretary to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore, Myzroi Department, Bangalore, for disposal.

2. Petitioner may be informed that His Highness the Maharaja will not interfere in the matter.

No. 566 of 07-08.

By Order,

I. C. S.
Private Secretary
to H. H. The Maharajal. of Mysore.

year?

Communicate
His order

in contn. of this office

no 1903 dated: 28th September 1906.

By order

Secretary

.21]

ನಂ. 2699/9.12.07

ಮೈಸೂರು ಶ್ರೀಮನ್ ಮಹಾರಾಜರವರ ಗವರ್ನಮೆಂಟ ಮುಜರಾಯಿ ಇಲಾಖೆಯಿಂದಾ

[illegible]

[illegible]

ನೀವು ಹಜೂರಿಗೆ ಜಾಹೀರ್ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡ 1901 ನೇ ಇಸವಿ ... ಮಾಹೆ ೩೦ ನೇ

ಮರ್ಕ್ಯಂ 566/1875 ನೇ ನಂಬರ ಅರ್ಜಿ ಪರಾಂಬರಿಸಲಾಯಿತು.

[illegible]

District, in continuation of this office no. 190
dated 28th September 1906.

By order

(Sd)

Secretary.